

**REMARKS**

In the amendments above, Claims 2, 3, 5, 26-31, 33, and 34 have been cancelled and Claims 1, 4, 6, 32, and 35 have been amended, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicants' invention. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 may be found in Claims 2, 3, and 5, and support for the amendment to Claim 32 may be found in Claims 33 and 34.

**EXAMINER'S REJECTIONS**

In the Office Action dated April 23, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 14-21, 23-30, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Clements et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,905,819 ("Clements"). The Examiner further rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clements in view of Amend, U.S. Patent No. 5,375,699 ("Amend"). The Examiner alleged that Clements discloses the claimed invention except the mirror. The Examiner further alleged that Amend teaches a contact lens case comprising a mirror on the interior surface of the lid for the purpose of easier insertion and removal of contact lenses by the user. The Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Clements with the mirror on a portion of the interior surface of the lid as taught by Amend in order to allow the user to view their reflection to make it easier to insert a contact lens.

The Examiner rejected Claims 22 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clements. Official Notice was taken that it is old and conventional to make the pressure application zone on a squeeze bottle to have a reduced thickness in comparison to the surrounding. The Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the Official Notice to have provided the pressure application zone of Clements with a reduced thickness in order to make it easier to apply pressure to the case.

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 5, 9-11, 13, and 34-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner's attention is directed to the amendments above, wherein Claims 1, 4, 6, 32, and 35 have been amended to put all of the claims herein in allowable condition.

In light of the amendments above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejections under §§ 102(b) and 103(a) and allow the claims herein.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Dippert

William H. Dippert  
Registration No. 26,723

Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP  
250 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10177-0030  
Telephone: 212.986.1116  
Facsimile: 212.986.0604  
e-Mail: [wdippert@wolfblock.com](mailto:wdippert@wolfblock.com)